



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. IV, 4.

WHOLE NO. 16.

---

## I.—THE NOCTES ATTICAE OF AULUS GELLIUS.

It is perhaps not generally realised that a large proportion of the surviving Greek and Latin literature consists of extracts and epitomes. This is the case with almost all the remains of ancient philology, criticism, and lexicography, and with a great part of the remains of ancient history and science; and thus it has come to pass that in Roman literature, for Nepos and Hyginus we have Valerius Maximus; for Verrius Flaccus, Festus and Paulus; for Probus and Pliny, Nonius, Charisius, Servius and Priscian; for Suetonius, Jerome and Isidore.

The passion for making epitomes, selections, *florilegia*, and miscellanies of all kinds began among the Romans in the first century after Christ, and continued in activity for a long subsequent period. The *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius is only one specimen of the results which it produced. Gellius himself tells us (Praef. 6 foll.) of the numerous works of this kind, with their equally numerous titles, that existed in his own day. *Nam quia variam et miscellam et quasi confusaneam doctrinam conquisierant, eo titulos quoque ad eam sententiam exquisitissimos indiderunt. Namque alii 'Musarum' inscripserunt, alii 'Silvarum'; ille πέπλον, hic 'Ἀραλθείας κέρας, alius κηρία, partim λειμώνας, quidam 'Lectionis suae,' alius 'Antiquarum Lectionum,' atque alius ἀνθηρῶν, et item alius εὐρημάτων. Sunt etiam qui λύχνους inscripserunt, sunt item qui σρωματείς, sunt adeo qui πανδέκτας et Ἑλικῶνα et προβλήματα et*

ἐγχειρίδια et παραξυφίδας. *Est qui 'Memoriales' titulum fecerit, est qui πραγματικά et πάρεργα et διδασκαλικά, est item qui 'Historiae Naturalis,' est praeterea qui 'Pratum,' et itidem qui πάγκαρπον, est qui τόπων scripsit. Sunt item multi qui 'Coniectanea,' neque item non sunt qui indices libris suis fecerint aut 'Epistularum Moralium' aut 'Epistularum quaestionum' aut 'Confusarum' et quaedam alia inscripta nimis lepida multasque prorsus concinnitates redolentia.* The authors of some of these works are known. The 'Ἀμαλθείας κέρας or *Cornu Copiae* was by Sotion, the *Antiquae Lectiones* by Caesellius Vindex, the *Historia Naturalis* by Pliny, the *Pratum* by Suetonius, the Πανδέκται by Tullius Tiro. The reference to a *Silvae* may possibly be explained as an allusion to the *Silva Observationum Sermonis Antiqui* by Valerius Probus: possibly Ἀθηναί may be the *Florida* of Apuleius. *Epistulae Quaestiones* was the title of a work by Varro, thrice quoted by Gellius (*Noctes Atticae*, 14, 8, 2); *Quaestiones Confusae* was the name given to his miscellaneous collections by Julius Modestus; a book of *Coniectanea* was written by Ateius Capito.

The gentile name of Aulus Gellius shows that he belonged to a very old Italian family. All that is known of his life and career may be briefly put together from his *Noctes Atticae*. He nowhere mentions his birthplace, but he was at Rome when he assumed the *toga virilis* in his sixteenth or seventeenth year (18, 4, 1). The date of his birth is only a matter of approximate inference. His residence as a student at Athens fell after the consulship of Herodes Atticus (143 B. C.), for Atticus is spoken of as *consularis vir* at the time (*Noctes Atticae*, 19, 12; 1, 2, 1). Gellius calls himself *iuuenis* while at Athens (15, 2, 3, and elsewhere): a term which it is surely unnecessary, with Teuffel, to press so far as to make it imply that Gellius was a man of thirty or so in these student years. Supposing him to have resided at Athens from the age of nineteen to that of twenty-three, he must have been born A. D. 123 or thereabouts.

The ordinary educational course in his day began with grammar, and passed through rhetoric to philosophy (10, 19, 1, *adulescentem a rhetoribus et a facundiae studio ad disciplinas philosophiae transgressum*). In grammar he attended, among other lectures, those of the learned Carthaginian scholar Sulpicius Apollinaris, also the master of the emperor Pertinax.<sup>1</sup> In rhetoric one of his favorite

<sup>1</sup> 7, 6, 12, *quem in primis sectabar*; comp. 20, 6, 1, *cum eum Romae adulescentulus sectarer*.

teachers was Antonius Julianus, described (19, 9, 2) as *docendis publice iuvenibus magister*, in whose company he seems to have spent many pleasant hours (9, 15). Another was Titus Castricius, a man *gravi atque firmo iudicio* (11, 13, 1), the chief professor of rhetoric in Rome.<sup>1</sup> Gellius also heard Fronto in Rome during his early youth.<sup>2</sup>

In philosophy his tutors were mainly Favorinus and Calvisius Taurus—Calvisius Taurus he heard at Athens, whither he went from Rome after finishing his course of rhetoric,<sup>3</sup> and appears, though to what extent is uncertain, to have studied Aristotle and Plato with him.<sup>4</sup>

Gellius also saw a great deal at Athens of the enigmatical philosopher Peregrinus, surnamed or nicknamed Proteus, of whom he gives a very different account from that of Lucian.<sup>5</sup> Had the eighth book of the *Noctes Atticae* survived we might have heard more of this interesting personage, who figured in the dialogue of the third chapter. During the same time he saw and heard the celebrated rhetorician Tiberius Claudius Atticus Herodes.<sup>6</sup>

There are several pleasant allusions, scattered up and down the *Noctes Atticae*, to Gellius's student life at Athens; to his boating-trips to Aegina and back (2, 21, 1); his excursion to Delphi (12, 5, 1); the monthly gatherings of students (15, 2, 3, *in conviviiis iuvenum, quae agitare Athenis hebdomadibus lunae sollemne nobis fuit*.)

It was after his return from Athens to Rome that Gellius became intimate with Favorinus,<sup>7</sup> and thus fell under a philosophical influ-

<sup>1</sup> 13, 22, 1, *rhetoricae disciplinae doctor, qui habuit Romae locum principem declamandi ac docendi, summa vir auctoritate gravitateque et a divo Hadriano in mores atque litteras spectatus.*

<sup>2</sup> 19, 8, 1, *adulescentulus Romae, priusquam Athenas concederem.*

<sup>3</sup> 17, 8, 1, *Philosophus Taurus accipiebat nos Athenis. 7, 13, 1, facilitatum observatumque hoc Athenis est ab his qui erant philosopho Tauro iunctiores. 19, 6, 2, hoc ego Athenis cum Tauro nostro legissem.*

<sup>4</sup> 7, 10, 1, *Taurus, vir memoria nostra in disciplina Platonica celebratus. 17, 20, 1, Symposium Platonis apud philosophum Taurum legebatur. 19, 6, 2, problemata Aristotelis.*

<sup>5</sup> 12, 11, 1, *Philosophum nomine Peregrinum, cui postea cognomentum Proteus factum est, virum gravem atque constantem, vidimus, cum apud Athenas essemus, deversantem in quodam tugurio extra urbem. Cumque ad eum frequenter ventitaremus, multa hercle dicere eum utiliter et honeste audivimus.*

<sup>6</sup> 19, 12; comp. 1, 2, 1.

<sup>7</sup> 14, 1, 1, *Audivimus quondam Favorinum philosophum Romae Graece disserentem egregia atque inlustri oratione. 1, 21, 4, cum Favorino Hygini commentarium*

ence which extended at least beyond the time at which he entered upon professional life.<sup>1</sup> If we may trust the impression left by the *Noctes Atticae*, Favorinus was not merely a technical metaphysician, but also an acute and learned scholar. As is well known, he was the author of works entitled ἀπορρημονεύματα and παροδαπή ἱστορία, the latter of which most probably suggested the form, if indeed it did not supply much of the contents, of the *Noctes Atticae*.

Once returned to Rome, Gellius seems to have entered upon active life, of what kind he does not tell us explicitly; but he was, *homo adulescens* as he says (14, 2, 1), chosen a judge for the decision of private causes. He can hardly have been older than 25 at this time.<sup>2</sup> In one other passage (12, 13, 1) he alludes to his undertaking judicial functions; but in other places his accounts of his life are somewhat vague, though they refer generally to a legal career.<sup>3</sup> There is no mention of elevation to any high office; perhaps the mediocrity which stamps his literary work may have been also obvious in the discharge of his judicial functions.

I now come to the most important and difficult part of my task, which is to give some account, and attempt some analysis, of the *Noctes Atticae*. It appears from the author's preface that before he published this work in its final shape he had laid the foundation for it in a number of excerpts. Praef. 2, *usi autem sumus ordine rerum fortuito, quem antea in excerpando feceramus. Nam proinde ut librum quemque in manus ceperam seu Graecum seu Latinum, vel quid memoratu dignum audieram, ita, quae libitum erat, cuius cunque generis erant, indistincte atque promisce adnotabam, eaque mihi ad subsidium memoriae quasi quoddam litterarum penus recondebam, etc.*

*egissem.* 10, 12, 9, *Favorinus philosophus, memoriarum veterum exequentissimus.* 16, 3, 1, *cum Favorino dies plerumque totos eram, tenebatque animos nostros homo ille fandi dulcissimus, atque eum, quoquo iret, quasi lingua eius prorsus capti prosequebamur.*

<sup>1</sup> 14, 2, 1, 11, *quo primum tempore a praetoribus lectus in iudices essem . . . a subsellis pergo ad Favorinum philosophum, quem in eo tempore Romae plurimum sectabar.* Comp. 2, 22, 1; 17, 10, 1; 18, 1, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Digest 42, 1, 571, *Quidam consulebat, an valeret sententia a minore viginti quinque annis iudice data.* 50, 4, 8, *ad rem publicam administrandam ante vicensimum quintum annum, vel ad munera quae non patrimonii sunt vel honores, admitti minores non oportet.*

<sup>3</sup> 12, 13, 1, *cum Romae a consulibus iudex extra ordinem datus . . . pronuntiare iussus sum.* 13, 13, 1, *cum ex angulis secretisque librorum ac magistrorum in medium iam hominum et in lucem fori prodissem.* 11, 3, 1, *quando ab arbitris negotiisque otium est.* 16, 10, 1, *otium erat quodam die Romae in foro a negotiis.* Praef. 12, *per omnia semper negotiorum intervalla.*

The title *Noctes Atticae* was given to the book simply as a record of the fact that Gellius began to make his collections during the long winter evenings of his student years at Athens. It is professedly a handbook of miscellaneous information, but aims, as its author expressly says, at being comparatively popular, and regards quality more than quantity in the facts presented. For the presence of some few specimens of recondite learning the author thinks it necessary to apologize.<sup>1</sup>

Gellius does not tell us what is sufficiently obvious to a reader of his book, that he has taken great pains to enliven his lessons by the form in which his scraps of information are presented. Often indeed an extract is simply copied from an older author, and given in its naked simplicity without introduction or citation of authority; but quite as often an attempt is made to set it in the frame of an imaginary dialogue, a description, or an anecdote. The uniformity of the devices employed is amusing. Certain individuals, as Favoninus, Fronto, Castricius, Calvisius Taurus, Sulpicius Apollinaris, figure as the interlocutors in the dialogue; but it is hardly to be supposed that the scenes into which they are introduced are other than fictitious. They may, of course, be taken as giving a general idea of the life of Gellius, his pursuits, and the sphere in which he moved; but they are, in all probability, no more historical than the introductory scenes of Plato's or Cicero's dialogues. As a foil to the instructed scholar or philosopher there often appears a conceited or affected or generally unseasonable individual<sup>2</sup> whose delusions are exposed by the light of superior wisdom. Sometimes the devil's advocate appears in another shape, as in 19, 1, 7, where a rich Asiatic Greek is disagreeable enough, on a sea-voyage, to ask a Stoic philosopher who has shown signs of alarm at a tempest, to explain to him how it is that he has been pale and trembling all the while, while the speaker has given no indication of fear.

<sup>1</sup> Praef. 11, 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup> 1, 2, 3, *adulescens philosophiae sectator . . . sed loquacior impendio et promptior.* 1, 10, 1, *adulescenti veterum verborum cupidissimo.* 4, 1, 1, *ostentabat quispiam grammaticae rei ditior scholica quaedam nugalia.* 5, 21, 4, *reprehensor audaculus verborum.* 6, 17, 1, 6, *grammaticum primae . . . celebritatis, . . . insolentis hominis inscitiam.* 7, 16, 1, *eiusmodi quispiam, qui tumultuariis et inconditis linguae exercitationibus ad famam sese facundiae promizerat.* 8, 10, *grammaticus quidam praestigiosus.* *ib.* 14, *intempestivus quidam de ambiguitate verborum disserens.* 9, 15, 1, *introit adulescens et praefatur arrogantius et elatius.* 11, 7, 3, *vetus celebratusque homo in causis, sed repentina et quasi tumultuaria doctrina praeditus.* 18, 4, 1 *iaclator quispiam et venditor Sallustianae lectionis.* 20, 10, 2, *ille me despiciens.*

Were these loquacious or ignorant or conceited individuals to be taken seriously, we should have reason to hold up our hands in horror at the social condition of the second century A. D.; but they are in all probability mere men of straw. In any case they are tedious enough; nor is their constant introduction the only instance of want of skill shown in the composition of the *Noctes Atticae*.

Sometimes, as Mercklin and Kretzschmer<sup>1</sup> have pointed out, the form of the dialogue is not consistently maintained through a whole chapter; thus in 1, 7 Gellius starts by quoting a passage from Cicero's fifth speech against Verres; no indication of time or place is given, yet in §3 the writer proceeds *videbatur compluribus in extremo verbo menda esse*, and in §4 *aderat forte amicus noster*. In 2, 22 an elaborate account of the winds is put into the mouth of Favorinus; the dialogue is continued to the end of §26, yet in §30 Gellius quotes something which he has already attributed to Favorinus as if he had said it himself. There is a similar awkwardness at the end of 5, 21, where an opinion of Sinnius Capito, having been originally introduced in the course of a supposed dialogue, is treated as if it had been cited by Gellius. In 13, 21, 9 it is quite clear that the passage discussed by Gellius had really been treated by Probus in the work from which the first part of the chapter is quoted, and this fact is enough to raise a suspicion that the anecdote about Probus is mere padding. A similar remark applies to the end of 19, 8, where there is no real distinction between the observations offered by Gellius himself and those previously put into the mouth of Fronto.

There are other marks of carelessness in composition. Gellius is apt, for instance, to introduce one of his interlocutors twice over, thus Herodes Atticus is described (1, 2) as *vir et Graeca facundia et consulari honore praeditus*, and so 9, 2 *Herodem Atticum, consularem virum ingenioque amoeno et Graeca facundia celebrem*. Antonius Julianus (1, 4, 1), *rhetor perquam fuit honesti atque amoeni ingenii; doctrina quoque ista utiliore (subtiliore, Madvig) ac delectabili veterumque elegantiarum cura et memoria multa fuit; ad hoc scripta omnia tam curiose spectabat, etc.* 19, 9, 1 *Antonius Julianus rhetor, docendis publice iuvenibus magister, Hispano ore florentisque homo facundiae et rerum litterarumque veterum peritus*. Titus Castricius, 11, 13, 1, *disciplinae rhetoricae doctor, gravi atque firmo iudicio vir*. 13, 22, *rhetoricae disciplinae doctor*,

<sup>1</sup> When Mercklin and Kretzschmer are quoted, the reference is to the essay of Mercklin, in the *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie*, Suppl. III (1860), and to that of Kretzschmer, *De Auli Gellii fontibus*, Greifswald, 1860.

*qui habuit Romae locum principem declamandi ac docendi, summa vir auctoritate gravitateque.* Apion, 5, 14, *qui Πλειστονείκης appellatus est, litteris homo multis praeditus rerumque Graecarum plurima atque varia scientia fuit.* 7, 8, 1, *Graecus homo qui Πλειστονείκης appellatus est, facili atque alacri facundia fuit.* Tullius Tiro, 6, 3, 8, *M. Ciceronis libertus, sane quidem fuit ingenio homo eleganti et haudquaquam rerum litterarumque veterum indoctus, eoque ab ineunte aetate liberaliter instituto adminiculatore et quasi administro in studiis litterarum Cicero usus est.* 13, 9, 1, *Tullius Tiro, M. Ciceronis alumnus et libertus adiutorque in litteris studiorum eius fuit.*

An extract is sometimes so carelessly torn from its context that marks of the rent are still visible. Thus the epitome of 3, 17 begins *id quoque esse a gravissimus viris memoriae mandatum*, where there is nothing in the previous chapter to lead up to the *quoque*. Exactly in the same way 10, 8, 1, *fuit haec quoque antiquitus militaris animadversio.* 12, 12, 1, *haec quoque disciplina rhetorica (? disciplinae rhetoricae ?) est.* 18, 12, 1, *id quoque habitum est in oratione facienda elegantiae genus.*

Sometimes Gellius alludes or seems to allude to things which he has nowhere said, or proposes discussions which are nowhere started: thus 2, 22, 31, *considerandum igitur est quid sit secundo sole*, a question which is not treated anywhere else; and so it is with 12, 14, 7, *censuimus igitur amplius quaerendum.* 13, 7, 6, *in quibus, quod super ipsa re scriptum invenerimus, cum ipsius Aristotelis verbis in his commentariis scribemus.* 14, 7, 13, *de hac omni re alio in loco plenius accuratiusque nos memini scribere* (a discussion on the forms of the *senatus consultum*, which occurs nowhere else, not even in the epitomes of the eighth book). 18, 4, 11, *quos notavi et intulisse iam me aliquo in loco commentationibus istis existimo.*

It should further be observed that the same point is sometimes treated twice in much the same words: compare 2, 26, 9; 3, 9, 9, *palmae termes ex arbore cum fructu evulsus 'spadix' dicitur:* σπάδικα δωρισί vocant avulsum e palma termitem cum fructu. 3, 16, §§18-19, 15, 5, 5, *adfecta . . . ea proprie dicebantur quae non ad finem ipsum sed proxime finem progressa deductave erant.* *Hoc verbum ad hanc sententiam Cicero in hac fecit quam dixit de provinciis consularibus.* The same quotation, with others, is given in 15, 5, 5.

We may now approach the central question, from what authors and from what works does Gellius mainly derive his information?



Like many other ancient writers, Gellius does not think it his duty in all cases to mention his authorities by name. While a large number of his chapters are anonymous, in an equally large number of instances he professes to have taken his information from one of his own contemporaries, Favorinus, Fronto, Castricius, Antonius Julianus, Calvisius Taurus, and so on. But the reader soon becomes convinced that these names are mere *personae* introduced to give an attractive setting to the extracts quoted under them. Deducting, then, this element of illusion, we have to ask what means we have for ascertaining the actual authorities consulted by Gellius? When he quotes Varro, for instance, can we be sure that he has read Varro, or is some intermediate work the source of his information?

Mercklin has called attention to a remarkable fact affecting Gellius's manner of quotation. We find that an ancient work is, in one place, cited under its proper title, while in another it is mentioned as if that title were unknown to the writer. Thus in 14, 3, 4 Plato's *Laws* is spoken of as *quidam liber*, while in 15, 2, §§3 and 4, Gellius seems to be aware that there was a work by Plato, *De Legibus*, and so again in 20, 1, 4. It sometimes, too, happens that the same work is quoted under slightly different titles; a fact, perhaps, of less importance. But the case of Plato's *νόμοι* makes it almost certain that Gellius did not know that work at first hand; and one instance is enough to make us justly suspicious in many more. Let us, for example, take 2, 21, 8, where Gellius gives the impression of citing, at first hand, Varro's opinion on the word *septemtriones*. A comparison of this passage with the similar one in Festus, p. 339 (Müller), leads almost irresistibly to the conclusion that Gellius's immediate authority was not Varro, but Verrius Flaccus quoting Varro.

Mercklin accuses our author, in one case, of something very like downright inveracity. In 9, 4, Gellius professes to quote from Aristæas, Isogonus, Ctesias, Onesicritus, Philostephanus, and Hegesias, certain wonderful stories, adding that he found *in isdem libris scriptum quod postea in libro quoque septimo Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historiae legi*. Now the first part of the chapter of Gellius (or rather much of the substance of it) is also to be found in Pliny 7, §11 foll., and Mercklin therefore infers that Gellius is indebted to Pliny for this part as well. In this instance, I am inclined to think, he is too hard upon Gellius. The difference of language between Gellius and Pliny is so considerable that it seems to me most probable that the two writers are here using the same authorities.

In 17, 15 Gellius borrows his whole account of the two kinds of hellebore from Pliny 25, 47 foll. But Pliny's name is not mentioned until the sixth section, and then only in such a way as to put the reader off the scent. The two following chapters, however, which contain stories of Mithridates and his knowledge of medicine and of languages, although they may be found in Pliny (25, 6; 29, 24) in a shorter form, contain some information which is absent from his text, and must therefore be taken from some common authority, perhaps the memoirs of Pompeius Lenæus.

The instance of 17, 15 will serve as a specimen of what we must look for throughout the whole of the *Noctes Atticæ*. Gellius often alludes to his authority, but gives the false impression that only a part of the chapter in which it is mentioned is borrowed from him.

It sometimes, to all appearance, happens that Gellius makes extracts from more than one work in the same chapter. At the end of 3, 9, for instance, after speaking of some proverbial expressions, he goes out of his way to inform us that *spadix* and *poeniceus* mean one and the same thing; at the end of 9, 1 there is a remark of a lexicographical character on the word *defendo*; so at the end of 10, 3 on *Bruttiani*, of 13, 11 on *bellaria*, of 13, 22 on *crepidarius*, of 20, 5 on *cognobilis*. Mercklin thinks the same was the case in other places.

Perhaps the best way of getting an approximate idea of the character of the works consulted by Gellius will be to analyse his whole book according to the subjects of which it treats. In this way we shall obtain a *conspectus* of its general scope, and shall also be able to establish a visible connection, not only between some neighboring chapters, but between distant parts of the *Noctes Atticæ*. This connection is sometimes so close as to lead irresistibly to the conclusion that the kindred sections belong to the same original work.

The *Noctes Atticæ* is a work of such miscellaneous contents that it is impossible to make an entirely satisfactory table of them. A margin of unclassified matter must remain, whatever principle of arrangement be adopted. A rough distribution of the main bulk into certain great divisions is however possible. We may take as the first branch that of philosophy, understanding that term to include metaphysics, psychology, logic, and morals.

The true as distinguished from the false study of philosophy is touched upon briefly in 1, 2, and 10, 22; but there is nothing in these chapters which should lead us to connect them. 5, 15, *cor-*

*pusne sit vox an ἀσώματον, varias esse philosophorum sententias*, is evidently from the same source as the following chapter, *de vi oculorum deque videndi rationibus*. The authority is at least as late as the Ciceronian age, and almost certainly Latin, as Lucretius and Ennius are quoted. The first and second chapters of the seventh book, in which the opinions of Chrysippus on Providence and on Fate are discussed, are no less obviously akin, and probably from the same source; which, if we may press the fact that Cicero is quoted at the end of the second chapter, was presumably a late one. The first chapter of the fourteenth book, *dissertatio Favorini philosophi adversus eos qui Chaldaei appellantur et ex coetu motibusque siderum et stellarum fata hominum dicturos pollicentur*, deals with a cognate subject.

Turning to ethics, we find a discussion as to the nature of the *summum bonum* between a Stoic and Peripatetic in the first chapter of the eighteenth book; the doctrine of Chrysippus περὶ καλοῦ καὶ ἡδονῆς as applied to the character of justice is expounded in 14, 4. Connected in subject with the latter is 9, 5, in which various philosophical views of pleasure, concluding with that of the Stoic Hierocles, are presented. Three chapters on the relation of reason to passion (1, 26; 12, 5; 19, 1) are closely connected, and may come from the same manual (a very late one), or set of lectures. The first, on anger, purports to be from Taurus and Plutarch; the second, which is also professedly from Taurus, deals with the Stoic theory of bearing pain; the third gives the opinion of Epictetus on the subject of fear. We may mention in this connection the discourse of Herodes Atticus against ἀπάθεια (19, 12).

The following chapters touch on various points of logic: 11, 12 (Chrysippus on ambiguous terms); 15, 26 (a proposed Latin translation of Aristotle's definition of a syllogism); 16, 8 (Latin equivalents for several Greek technical terms); 5, 10, 11 (the argument called ἀντιστρέφον, again treated in 9, 16); 18, 13 (a story of a fallacy tried unsuccessfully upon Diogenes). Of these 16, 8 deserves the most attention; I am tempted to think that it comes from Varro, whether from the lost twenty-fourth book of the *de Lingua Latina*, quoted in the fourth section, or from the *Disciplinae*.

The eighth and ninth chapters of the second book are from Plutarch; the second, fourth, fifth and sixth of the nineteenth book from the *Problemata* of Aristotle, though in the fifth chapter the debt is not quite directly acknowledged.

The ninth chapter of the first book, the eleventh of the fourth, and the fifth of the eleventh, touch on points connected with the history of philosophy: the first two treating of the Pythagorean discipline; the last, of the difference between Pyrrhonists and Academics.

We may now pass on to another head, that of ethical principles applied. Here some sort of classification is possible, though there are hardly any *data* for inference as to authorities. Four chapters (9, 2; 12, 11; 13, 8; 13, 24) treat of the relation of philosophy to conduct; of these, one (12, 11) contains a *dictum* of Peregrinus, *virum sapientem non peccaturum esse, etiamsi peccasse eum di atque homines ignoraturi forent*; the other three are protests lodged in various forms against dilettantism and hypocrisy in the philosophical profession. Two of these (13, 8; 13, 24) have a distinctly Roman tinge.

Four chapters are devoted to questions of casuistry. In 1, 3 Favorinus, quoting Theophrastus and Cicero, starts the problem *an pro utilitate amicorum delinquendum aliquando sit*. The second and third (1, 13 and 2, 7) open in very much the same way, *in officiis capiendis, censendis, iudicandisque, quae καθήκοντα philosophi appellant, quaeri solet, etc.* *Quaeri solitum est in philosophorum disceptationibus, an semper, etc.* Does this fact point to identity of source? The first discusses the question whether the letter or the spirit of an order is to be taken as the more important; the second, how far a parent's commands are to be taken as binding. Both questions are approached from a Roman point of view. The remaining casuistical chapter is 14, 2, where Gellius consults Favorinus *de officio iudicis*.

A number of exhortations to particular virtues and warnings against particular vices should be mentioned here. 1, 17 (from Varro), *de tollendis vitiis uxoris*. 2, 12, Solon's law enforcing the duty of taking a part in political dissensions, and Favorinus's view about a similar duty in private life. 12, 1, *Favorinus suadet nobili feminae uti liberos quos peperisset non nutricum aliarum sed suo sibi lacte aleret*. 13, 28, Panaetius *de cavendis iniuriis*. 17, 19, Epictetus (quoted by Favorinus) ἀνέχον καὶ ἀπέχον. 1, 15, Favorinus against the vice of loquacity. 6, 16; 15, 19, Varro (περὶ ἐδεσμάτων) against luxury. 9, 8 (Favorinus), *qui multa habet, multis eget*. 15, 8, an ancient orator *de cenarum atque luxuriae opprobratione*. 7, 11 (Metellus Numidicus), *cum inquinatissimis hominibus non esse convicio decertandum*. 8, 6 (Taurus, from Theophrastus and

Cicero), *cum post offensiunculas in gratiam redeatur, expostulationes fieri mutuas minime utile esse.* 10, 19 (Taurus), *non purgari neque levare peccatum cum praetenditur peccatorum, quae alii quoque peccaverunt, similitudo.*

A transition is natural from the last head to the *exempla* or remarkable instances of praiseworthy conduct cited in the *Noctes Atticae*. Among these two only are from Greek history, the story of the habits of Socrates put into the mouth of Favorinus (2, 1), and that told by Taurus (7, 10) about the youth of Euclides. The rest are Roman, and are as follows: 1, 14, the story of Fabricius and the Samnites; 2, 2, the two Fabii, father and son; 4, 8, Fabricius Luscinius and the avaricious Rufinus; 6, 18, the sanctity of oaths among the ancient Romans; 6, 19, Ti. Gracchus and Scipio Asiaticus; 7, 8, Scipio's continence; 7, 9, Cn. Flavius the *scriba*; 12, 4, Ennius's character as sketched by himself; 12, 8, the reconciliation of P. Scipio and Ti. Gracchus; 15, 12, C. Gracchus on his own quaestorship.

Of the authorities for some of these stories something certain may be said, at least on the negative side. Gellius has not borrowed anything from Valerius Maximus, natural as it would seem that he should have done so. In 12, 7, §8, after relating the story of Cn. Dolabella and the woman who was brought before him at Smyrna on the charge of poisoning her son and husband, he says *scripta haec historia est in libro Valeri Maximi factorum et dictorum memorabilium octavo*. Yet any careful reader of Gellius's narrative must see that although he has read Valerius Maximus (8, 1, 2 *damn.*), he has not copied him, for he adds two details about which Valerius is silent: *venenis clam datis*, of the one murder; *exceptum insidiis*, of the other. Again, let us compare Gellius 1, 14 with Valerius Maximus 4, 3, 6. The story (of C. Fabricius and the Samnite envoys) is told by Gellius in a far fuller and more characteristic manner than by Valerius. Gellius professes to take it from Hyginus, *de vita rebusque inlustrium virorum*, which was probably the common authority for both writers. Both writers again have a story about Fabricius Luscinius and Cornelius Rufinus (Gellius 4, 8, Valerius Maximus 2, 9, 4) which occurs in a different context in Gellius from that in which it is set by Maximus. The style of Gellius's narrative in this case tempts me to suppose that it is from the hand of a classical writer, such as Hyginus or Nepos. The work of Nepos called *exempla* is quoted explicitly by Gellius when, in the eighteenth chapter of his sixth book, he is narrating

the history of the ten captives who returned to Rome after Cannae; indeed it is not impossible that the whole of the chapter comes from this work. The same may be the case with the story in the following chapter about Ti. Gracchus and Scipio Asiaticus, which is given in an abridged form by Valerius Maximus (4, 1, 8). For Gellius begins by saying *pulchrum atque liberale atque magnanimum factum Ti. Sempronii Gracchi in exemplis repositum est*. The story of Scipio's continence (7, 8) is apparently drawn from an older source than the version given by Valerius Maximus (4, 3, 1). The relation between the two writers is, I think, the same with regard to the two narratives given by Gellius 12, 8, and Valerius Maximus 4, 2, 3; 4, 2, 1.<sup>1</sup> Thus in six instances it is highly probable that Gellius follows an authority older than Valerius Maximus; in one of them he expressly cites Hyginus, in another Nepos; and it is therefore not rash to infer that he is indebted to these two writers for a considerable part of his information under the head which we have been discussing.

Five chapters of the *Noctes Atticae* are devoted to natural philosophy; these are 2, 22, on the winds; 2, 26, on the names of colors; 2, 30, on the effect of different winds on the motion of the waves; 9, 1, on the direction of blows as influencing their strength. Of these, chapters 2, 22 and 2, 30 must be derived from the same sources as the corresponding passages in Pliny (2, 126 foll.)

There are also four chapters on points of human pathology; 3, 16 (*temporis varietas in puerperis mulierum*), partly from Varro. 4, 19, again from Varro, *de moderando victu puerorum inpubium*. 17, 11, from Plutarch, *de habitu atque natura stomachi*. 18, 10, *errare istos, qui in exploranda febris venarum pulsus pertemptari putant, non arteriarum*.

The department of rhetoric is not very fully represented in the *Noctes Atticae*. The notes which fall under this head consist mainly of criticisms on passages in the ancient orators from Cato to Cicero, and exhibit a considerable similarity; but it is hardly possible to infer anything as to their source. Indeed it is not impossible that they come, as they profess to do, from the contemporaries of Gellius himself. We may notice as kindred in spirit

<sup>1</sup> Mercklin thinks that the story of Aemilius Lepidus and Fulvius Flaccus comes directly from Valerius Maximus. There seems, however, to be nothing in the language to necessitate such a conclusion, while of the preceding story about the older Africanus and Ti. Gracchus, Gellius gives a fuller, and therefore probably an older, version.

the remarks of Castricius upon Metellus Numidicus (1, 6), and the defence of Cato against the strictures of Tullius Tiro (6, 3). In both chapters the point insisted on is the difference between the manner suitable to an advocate and that suitable to a statesman. Perhaps we may also connect 12, 12 and 16, 2, which deal with the art of reply. Cicero is defended against captious criticism in 1, 4 and 17, 5. The remaining chapters do not admit of any classification; they are 9, 15 (a case of ἀπορον or *inexplicable*); 17, 12 (*materiae infames*); 17, 20 (a translation of a passage in Plato's *Symposium*).

If the contributions of Gellius to the art of rhetoric are scanty, the same cannot be said of the passages of ancient literary criticism which he has preserved. Twenty-eight chapters are devoted to this subject, some of which may be easily arranged together as containing similar matter. Nine are given to the question of translation or adaptation from Greek into Latin. These are 2, 23, where Caecilius is compared, much to his disadvantage, with Menander; 11, 4, a criticism of a translation from Euripides by Ennius. 2, 27, where Castricius is represented as contrasting Sallust's description of Sertorius with that of Philip by Demosthenes. 8, 8 and 17, 20; which touch upon Gellius's own efforts at rendering Plato. 9, 9; 13, 27; 17, 10, comparisons with the originals of Vergil's renderings or adaptations of Theocritus, Homer, Parthenius, and Pindar. 19, 11, a translation by a friend of Gellius of some erotic verses by Plato. It is natural to suppose that some of these criticisms are taken from a manual in which the whole question of translation was discussed. Such a work, in all probability, was the *ὁμοιότητες* of Octavius Avitus, mentioned by Suetonius in his life of Vergil.

1, 10 and 11, 7 contain protests against the affectation of antiquarianism in writing. General remarks on style will be found in 2, 5 (a short comparison between Plato and Lysias); 10, 3, where the styles of Gracchus and Cicero are contrasted; 16, 1 (the expression of the same thought by Cato and Musonius). 11, 13, and 14, which contain the praises of C. Gracchus and the historian L. Piso, seem to be intimately connected. Other chapters falling under this head are 15, 24 (the metrical criticism of Roman comedians by Volcatius Sedigitus); 6, 14, where Varro's distinction between the three styles (*uber*, *gracilis*, *mediocris*) is quoted; 18, 8 (Lucilius on *ὁμοιοτέλευτα*); and 12, 2 (Seneca upon Ennius and Cicero).

Three chapters (3, 1; 4, 15; 10, 26) are devoted to criticism,

mainly defensive, of Sallust, whose abrupt and antiquarian style appears to have attracted a great deal of attention on the part of scholars and literary men. Three again (5, 8; 9, 10; 10, 16) contain pleadings in defence of Vergil against strictures of Hyginus and Cornutus, taken possibly from the work of Asconius *contra obtrectatores Vergilii*. In 15, 6 attention is drawn to a mistake of Cicero's. Finally, 3, 3 deals (after Varro) with the question of the genuine and spurious plays of Plautus.

History and biography absorb thirty-six chapters. Among these we may fairly distinguish the following groups: (1) 1, 23; 9, 11, 13, on Roman *cognomina* (Praetextatus, Corvinus, and Torquatus). These notices are so similar in tone and composition as to suggest the inference that they come from the same source, which may have been perhaps the work of Cornelius Epicadus, Sulla's freedman, on *cognomina*. It should be observed that the twenty-third chapter of the first book is verbally identical with a passage in the first book of Macrobius's *Saturnalia* (1, 6, 18 foll.). It has been of course assumed that Macrobius borrowed from Gellius; but against this hypothesis it may be urged that Macrobius goes on to supplement the story about Praetextatus by further information respecting other *cognomina* unknown to Gellius, and this in such a natural and easy way as to lead us to suppose that the whole passage is taken from some book which dealt in a comprehensive way with the whole subject. We should probably have known more of this work and its contents had the last book of Nonius been preserved. (2) Six chapters (1, 24; 3, 3; 8, 15; 12, 4; 13, 2; 17, 14) are devoted to interesting passages in the lives of Latin poets. In one of these cases the relation between Gellius and Macrobius is precisely the same as that which has just been considered. I allude to the notice of Publilius Syrus, which is fuller in Macrobius 2, 7 than in Gellius 17, 14. Is Varro the authority for these fragments of biography? he is expressly quoted in 1, 24, and 3, 3. (3) Fragments of biographies of Greek poets are preserved 3, 11; 15, 20; 17, 4. The last of these comes ostensibly from the *Chronicon* of Apollodorus, but may well have been taken from Varro's adaptations from that work; for Varro is actually cited in 3, 11. (4) Another group of chapters (5, 3; 13, 5; 14, 3; 20, 5) deals with lives of Greek philosophers; while (5) a large number contains notes of remarkable facts from Roman history (1, 13 end; 2, 11; 3, 7, 8; 4, 14, 18; 7, 3, 4; 10, 27, 28; 15, 4, 11; 18, 22). We are here brought back to the question of



the relation between Gellius and Valerius Maximus, and are led to the same conclusion as before. Gellius generally transcribes, not from Maximus, but from writers much older. Both authors give a catalogue of the exploits of L. Sicinius Dentatus (Maximus 3, 2, 24; Gellius 2, 11). The facts narrated are the same, but the style of Gellius is simpler and more antique, and Valerius Maximus expressly mentions Varro among his authorities. It is therefore possible that Gellius has preserved the account given by Varro. The story of Pyrrhus and the consuls Fabricius and Aemilius is given by Gellius (3, 8) directly from Claudius Quadrigarius; Valerius Maximus's version (6, 5, 1) is much shorter. So again the history of Scipio Africanus and his accusers is told more fully and accurately by Gellius (4, 18) than by Valerius (3, 7, 1). A similar remark applies to the accounts of the death of Regulus (Maximus 9, 2, Ext. 1; Gellius 7, 4). For the rest, 10, 27 (*historia de populo Romano deque populo Poenico, quod pari propemodum vigore fuerint aemuli*) bears the name of Varro; 10, 28 (the classes of Servius Tullius), that of Tubero. 15, 4 (*historia de Ventidio Basso*) must be from Suetonius, whose name appears at the end of the chapter; and so perhaps 15, 11 (*de exigendis urbe Roma philosophis*), the authority of which is later than the accession of Domitian.

To arithmetic and geometry a few sections only are given: 1, 1 (from Plutarch), *de comprehendenda corporis proceritate qua fuit Hercules*. 1, 20, containing Latin equivalents for Greek geometrical terms. 3, 10, *septenarii numeri vis et facultas*. 16, 18, *lepida quaedam et memoratu et cognitu de parte geometriae quae ὀπτική appellatur, etc.* 18, 14, *quid sit numerus hemiolios, quid epitritos; et quod vocabula ista non facile nostri ausi sunt convertere in linguam Latinam*. 18, 15, *quod M. Varro in herois versibus observaverit rem nimis anxiae et curiosae observationis*. Of these four, 1, 20; 3, 10; 16, 18; 18, 15, bear the name of Varro, 18, 15 quoting expressly from his work entitled *Disciplinae*. It is highly probable that 1, 20; 16, 18; 18, 14 come from the same treatise.

The name of Gellius is perhaps most familiarly connected in the minds of modern students with the subject of Roman antiquities, social, political, and religious. To this upwards of thirty chapters, and those on the whole very important, are set apart. The following groups may be distinguished: (1) notes on religious antiquities. 1, 12, perhaps from Antistius Labeo, *virgo Vestae quid aetatis et ex quali familia et quo ritu quibusque caerimoniis et religionibus,*

*ac quo nomine a pontifice maximo capiatur, et quo statim iure esse incipiat simul atque capta est; quodque, ut Labeo dicit, nec intestato cuiquam nec eius intestatae quisquam iure heres est.* 10, 15, *de flaminis Dialis deque flaminicae caerimoniis; verbaque ex edicto praetoris apposita quibus dicit non coacturum se ad iurandum neque virgines Vestae neque Dialem;* this chapter bears the names of Varro and Masurius Sabinus. 2, 28, apparently from Varro, *non esse compertum cui deo rem divinam fieri oporteat, cum terra movet.* (2) On social customs. 2, 15, *quod antiquitus aetati senectae potissimum habiti sunt ampli honores, et cur postea ad maritos et ad patres idem isti honores delati sint;* the authority is uncertain, but not older than the *leges Iuliae*. 5, 13, *de officiorum gradu atque ordine moribus populi Romani observato.* This chapter quotes from Masurius Sabinus. 6, 4, *cuiusmodi servos et quam ob causam Caelius Sabinus, iuris civilis auctor, pilleatos venum dari solitos scripserit.* 6, 12, *de tunicis chiridotis: quod earum usum P. Africanus Sulpicio Gallo obiecit.* The authority for this chapter must be later than Vergil, who is quoted in it. 10, 23, *de mulierum veterum victu et moribus;* perhaps from Varro. 11, 6, in which Varro is quoted, *quod mulieres Romae per Herculem non iuraverint neque viri per Castorem.* (3) 4, 3, and 4, on points of the Roman marriage laws, from Servius Sulpicius *de dotibus*. (4) Notes on the powers of certain high officers: the censors, 4, 12, 20; 6, 22, the aediles and quaestors, 13, 12, and 13, mostly from Varro. 14, 7, *de officio senatus habendi;* 8, *an praefectus Latinarum causa ius senatus convocandi consulendique habeat,* both from Ateius Capito. (5) Questions of military antiquities. 5, 6, *de coronis militaribus,* partly at least from Masurius Sabinus. 10, 8, *inter ignominias militares quibus milites exercebantur fuisse sanguinis dimissionem.* 10, 9, *quibus modis quoque habitu acies Romana instrui solita sit.* 10, 25, *telorum et iaculorum gladio- rumque, atque inibi navium quoque vocabula, quae scripta in veterum libris reperiuntur.* This last chapter should be compared with the thirteenth and nineteenth books of Nonius and parts of the eighteenth and nineteenth of Isidore's *Origines*. The three accounts have the appearance of coming from a common authority, which was probably the *Pratum* of Suetonius. 16, 4, the ancient form of declaring war, and the military oath. This chapter has in §5 matter given also by Paulus, p. 112. (6) Extracts from the augur Messala's work *de auspiciis*, the *pomerium*, the *minores* and *maiores magistratus; aliud esse contionem habere, aliud cum*

*populo agere*; 13, 14; 15, 16. We should also mention the following chapters: 3, 2, on the Roman day, from Varro, supplemented by an early commentator on Vergil. This account is to be found in Macrobius Sat. 1, 3, continued and completed. 5, 19, quoting Masurius Sabinus, on adoption. 15, 27 (Laelius Felix from Labeo), on the *comitia*.

There are also four chapters on legal history: 2, 24, on the *leges sumptuariae*, from the *coniectanea* of Ateius Capito. 6, 15, and 11, 18, on *furtum*, from Antistius Labeo and Masurius Sabinus respectively; and 20, 1, professedly a dialogue between Caecilius and Favorinus on some passages in the twelve tables.

But Latin lexicography is the subject which absorbs most of the chapters that can be assigned to any single branch of learning. If I am not mistaken, more than one hundred chapters, about a quarter of the whole work, are devoted to it. Among these we may without difficulty distinguish five groups, which should perhaps be respectively assigned to different authorities. The first of these groups, embracing by far the largest part of the whole, contains articles of pure lexicography, as follows. 1, 16, on the use of *mille* in the singular, compare Festus, p. 153, *mille singulariter dicebant*. Macrobius has the same note (1, 5, 4 foll.)

1, 25, *indutiae*.

2, 4, *divinatio*. (Partly from Gavius Bassus *de origine vocabulorum*.)

2, 10, *favisae*. Compare Paulus, p. 88.

2, 16, *postumus*. Partly from Caesellius Vindex.

2, 19, *rescire*.

2, 21, *septem triones*. Compare Festus, p. 339.

3, 9, *equus Seianus, aurum Tolosanum*. From Gavius Bassus and Julius Modestus.

3, 16, §§18, 19, *adfectius*.

3, 18, *pedarii senatores*. Gavius Bassus is mentioned, but the bulk of the note may be from Verrius Flaccus, compare Festus, p. 210.

4, 1, *penus*. The latest authority quoted is Masurius Sabinus, but the word was treated by Verrius; see Festus, p. 250.

4, 6, *praecidaneus* and *succidaneus*. Compare Festus, pp. 218, 302.

4, 9, *religiosus*. Compare Festus, pp. 278, 289.

4, 12, *impolitiae*. Compare Paulus, p. 108.

5, 12, *Veiovis*. Compare Festus, p. 379, and for the note on *Lucetius*, Paulus, p. 114.

5, 17, *dies atri*. This note is avowedly from Verrius Flaccus, and so also the following one (5, 18) on *historia* and *annales*.

5, 21, *pluria, compluria, compluriens*. Compare Paulus, p. 59; the note, however, professes to come from Sinnius Capito.

6, 4, *sub corona venire*. Compare Festus, p. 306, who quotes the same passage from Cato, so that the article, though taken directly from Caelius Sabinus, may ultimately come from Verrius Flaccus.

6, 13, *classicus, infra classem*. For the latter compare Paulus, p. 113, and for *classicus*, Paulus, p. 56, on *classici testes*.

6, 17, *obnoxius*.

7, 5, *purus putus*. From Verrius; see Festus, p. 217.

7, 16, *deprecor*.

8, 10, *halophanta*. Compare Paulus, p. 101.

8, 12, *plerique omnes*.

8, 13, *cupsones*.

8, 14, words from Naevius and Cn. Gellius.

9, 1, §8, *defendo*.

10, 3, §18, *Bruttiani*. Probably from Verrius; compare Paulus, p. 31.

10, 11, *maturus, praecox* (= Macrobius 6, 8, 7 foll.)

10, 13, *cum partim*.

10, 14, *contumelia mihi factum itur*.

10, 20, *lex, rogatio*, etc. For *privilegium* compare Paulus, p. 226.

10, 29, *atque, deque*.

11, 1, *Italia, multa*. For *Italia* compare Paulus, p. 106.

11, 2, *elegans*.

11, 3, *pro*. Compare Paulus, p. 228.

11, 7, *apluda, flocces, bovinator*. For *apluda* and *bovinator* compare Paulus, pp. 10, 30.

11, 11, *mentiri* and *mendacium dicere*. From Nigidius Figulus.

11, 17, *retare flumina*. Compare Festus, p. 273.

12, 10, *aeditumus*. Compare Paulus, p. 13.

12, 13, *intra Kalendas*.

12, 14, *saltem*.

13, 1, *fatum* and *natura*.

13, 11, §7, *bellaria*. Compare perhaps Paulus, p. 35.

13, 17, *humanitas*.

13, 18, *inter os atque offam*.

13, 22, §§7, 8, *gallicae, crepidarius*.

13, 23, *Nerio, Neriene*.

- 13, 25 (beginning), *manubiae*.  
 13, 29, *multi mortales*.  
 13, 30, *facies*.  
 13, 31, *caninum prandium*.  
 15, 30, *petorritum*. Compare Paulus, p. 207.  
 16, 5, *vestibulum*. The remarks on *vescus* closely resemble the note on this word in Paulus, p. 368.  
 16, 6, *bidens*. This note is either from Hyginus, as it professes to be, or from Verrius Flaccus; compare Paulus, p. 35.  
 16, 9, *susque deque*. The note on this phrase in Festus, p. 290, has nothing in common with this chapter.  
 16, 10, *proletarii, adsidui*. Compare Paulus, pp. 9, 226.  
 16, 13, *municipium* and *colonia*.  
 16, 14, *festinare* and *properare*. From Verrius Flaccus.  
 16, 16, *Agrippa*.  
 16, 17, *Vaticanus collis*. This and the preceding note are from Varro's *Rerum Divinarum*.  
 17, 6, *servus recepticius*. Suggested by a passage in the *de obscuris Catonis* of Verrius Flaccus.  
 17, 13, various meanings of *quin*.  
 18, 2, §12 foll., *verare*.  
 18, 7, *contio*. Avowedly from Verrius Flaccus.  
 18, 9, *inseco*. Ultimately, perhaps, from Verrius; compare Paulus, p. 111, s. v. *insece*.  
 19, 10, *praeter propter*.  
 19, 13, *nanus*. Compare Festus, p. 176.  
 20, 2, *siticines*. Professedly from Ateius Capito and Caesellius Vindex.  
 20, 3, *sicinnista*.  
 20, 5, §13, *cognobilis*.  
 20, 10, *ex iure manu consertum*.  
 20, 11, *sculna*. From Lavinius *de verbis sordidis*.  
 A considerable number of these notes, it will have been observed, coincides to a greater or less extent with articles in Festus or Paulus, and may therefore with some probability be referred to Verrius Flaccus.  
 The second group of lexicographical notices contains remarks on the usages of particular authors.  
 12, 15, adverbs used by Sisenna.  
 17, 2, words found in the *annales* of Claudius Quadrigarius.  
 19, 7, words used by Laevius.

17, 1, Cicero's use of *paenitere*.

10, 26, peculiar usages of Sallust.

15, 25; 20, 9, words invented by Matius.

16, 7, bold expressions of Laberius.

18, 11, expressions of Furius Antias, objected to by Caesellius Vindex.

2, 6; 7, 6; 8, 5, peculiarities in the diction of Vergil; defended against the attacks of Hyginus or Cornutus.

The Vergilian notes, as they are all defensive, may perhaps come from Asconius *contra obtrectatores Vergilii*. Some of the others may possibly be referred to Caesellius Vindex, who is mentioned in 18, 11.

The third group consists of remarks on words which had changed their meaning since the classical period.

1, 22, *superesse*.

2, 20, *vivaria*.

6, 11, *levitas* and *nequitia*.

8, 14, words used in unusual senses by Naevius and Cn. Gellius.

10, 21, *novissimus* and *novissime*.

13, 6, *barbarismus*.

15, 5, *profligare*.

The similarity of these articles tempts one to refer them to a separate work.

Fourthly, there are a few articles treating of differences of meaning between words apparently synonymous. These are

3, 12, *bibax* and *bibosus*. From the *commentarii grammatici* of Nigidius Figulus.

3, 14, *dimidium* and *dimidiatum*.

4, 2, *morbus* and *vitium*. The latest authority quoted is Caelius Sabinus.

13, 3, *necessitudo* and *necessitas*.

18, 4, *vānus* and *stolidus*. Ultimately, perhaps, from Nigidius.

18, 6, *matrona* and *mater familias*. Aelius Melissus corrected by a reference, in all probability, to Verrius Flaccus; compare Paulus, p. 125, s. v. *matrona* and *mater familias*.

Fifthly, three chapters deal with words of double meaning: 8, 14; 9, 12, *formidolosus*, *infestus*, *nescius*, etc., and adjectives used in both an active and a passive sense. Part of this note is from Nigidius. 12, 9, *periculum*, *venenum*, *contagium*, *honor*, all of which, it is observed, are used both in a good and a bad sense.

Etymology is represented by ten chapters: 1, 18, a discussion, started by a passage in Varro, on the derivation of *fur*; 3, 19, on

*parcus*, from Gavius Bassus *de origine verborum et vocabulorum*; 5, 7, from the same work, on *persona*; 7, 12, in which it is shown that *sacellum* is not a compound word; 10, 5, in which the same is shown (as against Nigidius) of *avarus*; 12, 3, on *lictor*, from Valgius and Tullius Tiro; 13, 9, on *hyades*, from Tiro and a later scholar; 13, 4, on *soror* and *frater*, the first from Antistius Labeo, probably quoting Nigidius; 15, 3, on *aufugio*, suggested by a passage in Cicero; 16, 12, suggested by Cloatius Verus, on some words supposed to be taken from the Greek.

Discussions on difficult points of Latin Grammar take up upwards of thirty chapters. 2, 3; 10, 4; 19, 14 treat of the pronunciation of particular letters, *h*, *v*, and some others. 10, 4 and 19, 14 are from the *commentarii* of Nigidius. Five deal with points of prosody; 2, 17 (the quantity of *in* and *con* in composition); 4, 7, from Probus, on the quantity of the oblique cases of Hannibal and Hasdrubal; 4, 17 (*ob* and *con* before compounds of *iacio*); 7, 15 (the second syllable of *quiesco*); 9, 6 (the first syllable of *actito*). Three touch on questions of accentuation: 6, 7; 13, 26; 17, 3, §5; two on unexpected uses of the singular and plural, 2, 13; 19, 8. Seven are on case-forms: 4, 16 on the genitive in *-uis* and dative in *-u* of the fourth declension; 9, 14, on the genitive singular of the fifth declension. In the latter chapter Caesellius Vindex is mentioned; the former may be from Pliny, who is quoted as the authority for the similar though much shorter statement of Charisius, p. 143 K. 8, 1 and 10, 24, on *noctu hesternum* and *die crastini*, form part of the same statement, as may easily be seen by a comparison of Macrobius 1, 4, 16 foll., who has the same instances differently arranged. Compare also Charisius, p. 207, and Nonius, p. 98. 10, 1 discusses the question whether *tertium* or *tertio* is the right form of the adverb, and bears the names of Varro and Tullius Tiro; 20, 6 asks whether *curam vestri* or *vestrum* is right. There are two chapters on points of gender, 6, 2, on the gender of *cor*, from Terentius Scaurus, and 15, 9, on that of *frons*. With the last note we may compare Festus, p. 286, where *recto fronte* is likewise quoted from Cato. Four are on verb-inflection: 6, 9, on the forms *memordi*, *spependi*, and *cecurri*, which bears the name of Probus, from whom it very probably comes; 15, 13 and 18, 12, on verbs used both in the active and passive form; probably either from Probus or Pliny;<sup>1</sup> 15, 15, on the perfect participle passive of *pando*.

<sup>1</sup> Priscian (1, p. 393 K) expressly mentions these scholars as having dealt with this subject. For a full discussion of the point I may refer to Conington's Virgil, Vol. 1 (4th edition), p. lxxi foll.

A syntactical question (*exigor portorium*) is touched upon in 15, 14.

A curious and interesting, though not a very large, section of the *Noctes Atticae* is that which deals with points of textual criticism. Two notices under this head are expressly said to be taken from Probus: 1, 15, §18, on *loquentia* and *eloquentia*, and 13, 21, on *urbes* and *urbis* in Vergil. Others are so similar to these in manner and treatment that it is natural to refer them to the same scholar. An appeal is constantly made to good manuscripts against bad; for instance, in 1, 7 to the Tironian recension of Cicero; in 1, 16, §15, and 9, 14, to good copies of Cicero; in 1, 21 and 9, 14, to an autograph copy of Vergil, or copies known to have been in his house; in 2, 14 and 10, 13 to good manuscripts of Cato; similarly to good copies in 5, 4 of Fabius Pictor, in 6, 20 of Catullus, in 9, 14; 20, 6 of Sallust, in 18, 5 of Ennius. Probus, as we know from his short memoir by Suetonius, gave an immense amount of attention to the collection of good manuscripts of classical authors. The notes just mentioned are very much what he might be supposed to have written, and are, moreover, marked, on the whole, by the same trenchant and positive style.

The remaining sections of the *Noctes Atticae* hardly admit of any logical arrangement. One set of chapters<sup>1</sup> may perhaps be noted as chronicling *mirabilia* or remarkable natural phenomena; another<sup>2</sup> consists of notes on remarkable events. A third group may, for want of a better expression, be said to contain *res memoria dignas*.<sup>3</sup> A fourth consists of anecdotes.<sup>4</sup> Sometimes the true authority is certainly given; in one case it is Sotion's *κέρας Ἀμαλθείας*, in another the *liber rerum memoria dignarum* of Verrius Flaccus; and these or similar works, such as the *παντοδαπή ιστορία* of Favorinus, may have been the sources of the whole.

The foregoing rough analysis is offered as an aid towards ascertaining the principles which underlie the apparent chaos of the *Noctes Atticae*, and the probable character and periods of the authorities from whom Gellius mostly derived his knowledge.

<sup>1</sup> 3, 6; 8, 4; 9, 4; 10, 2; 10, 12; 16, 15.

<sup>2</sup> 3, 15; 4, 5; 7, 17; 15, 10; 15, 16 (3, 15 and 15, 16 seem to come from some book on remarkable deaths; see Pliny 7, 180, where Verrius Flaccus is mentioned as having chronicled a good many).

<sup>3</sup> 1, 11; 4, 13; 5, 9; 5, 14; 6, 6; 6, 8; 9, 7; 10, 17; 12, 7; 13, 7; 15, 7; 16, 3; 16, 11; 16, 19; 17, 15; 17, 16; 17, 17; 20, 7; 20, 8.

<sup>4</sup> 1, 5; 1, 8; 3, 4; 3, 5; 3, 13; 3, 17; 5, 2; 5, 5; 6, 1; 6, 5; 8, 9; 8, 11; 9, 3; 10, 6; 10, 18; 11, 8; 11, 9-10; 12, 6; 13, 4; 15, 2; 15, 17; 15, 31.



The element of purely miscellaneous information, of information which defies rational arrangement, has turned out to be comparatively small, and to include not much more than an eighth part of the whole work. A large part of the *Noctes Atticae* is given to philosophy, including under that term logic, ethics, speculative and practical, and natural science; a fraction to rhetoric, something to literary criticism, a respectable *quota* to history and Roman antiquities, more than a quarter of the whole to lexicography and etymology, and something considerable to grammar and textual criticism. Thus the bulk of the work is taken up with the subjects which formed the main elements of a liberal education in the second century: philosophy, rhetoric, history, literature, and philology. Whether any of Gellius's authorities are older than Varro is very doubtful. We cannot fail to be struck with the fact that large as is the amount of discussion and information bearing upon philosophical questions, that devoted to lexicography, grammar, and criticism of text and style, by far outweighs it both in quantity and in value. The phenomenon is typical of the state of Italian taste and feeling. More than ever before, the attention of the Roman *litterati* is turned to questions of mere form. The genius of classical Italy is dead, and, if Renan may be believed, the distinctive character of the ancient world is passing away. Philosophy is fashionable at court and in the higher ranks of society, but its creative impulse has long been spent, and it has become mainly, if not entirely, a means of enforcing ethical principles in the relations of public and private life. A knowledge of Greek and Roman history is indeed expected, but it is to be employed partly as an instrument for the moral training of the young, partly as an accomplishment for the superficial uses of riper years. Of writing history in the great manner there seems to be no idea. Turning to rhetoric and literary criticism, we find that its masters have become pedants, with little further claim to distinction than that conferred by the hold which they have gained over their wealthy or aristocratic pupils, to whom they repeat the *dicta* of earlier masters. The Hellenic and Italian elements of literature are inextricably blended, not as in the classical period, when the study of Greek seemed only to intensify the natural characteristics of Italian genius, but in a colorless, insipid, featureless unity. Favorinus, Herodes Atticus, Marcus Aurelius prefer Greek to Latin as a channel of expression. The effort to form a new Latin style, which, beginning in the first century A. D., culminated in the prose of Seneca and Tacitus, has

exhausted itself, and only the antiquarian impulse retains any life. There is as little notion of forming a genuine literary style, as there is in the nineteenth century of inventing a new form of architecture. The question is not how to say a thing in the best way, but what Cato or Gracchus or Cicero said. To read Fronto or Gellius, one would suppose that no one had written since Horace. The age has no vigor of its own, but builds the sepulchres of the prophets, and waits for inspiration to rise from their dust. Grammar is merely a study of ancient forms, and even advocates in the courts are represented as anxious to air their antiquarian knowledge by puzzling the presiding praetor with obsolete expressions met with in the pages of forgotten authors. Such is the impression of the age in which he lived, presented by a man of cool head, sober judgment, and moral heart, but devoid of imaginative power. Had Gellius been a man of genius, he would, it may easily be supposed, have painted a more vivid and interesting, but not so sober and realistic a picture.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.